

REMARKS

The present communication is responsive to the Official Action dated September 12, 2005, rejecting all the claims currently pending in the application, namely claims 1-7 and 10-19 ("Official Action"). Of these claims, claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 are independent.

A one-month extension of the term to respond, up to and including January 12, 2006, is filed concurrently herewith.

Applicant notes with appreciation the time the Examiner took on January 6, 2006, to discuss the Official Action and provide the clarification sought by the undersigned with respect the Official Action.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "providing a register in the electronic device, the register having a write area and a read area for setting of codes of functions associated with different types of devices and to be executed by the electronic device."

Claim 6 has been amended to recite "a register for setting codes of functions to be executed by the electronic device and associated with different types of devices." Claim 6 has been also amended to recite "the register including a write area in which the code of a function requested by the main unit is written, and a read area in which the code of a function selected in the electronic device is read and detected by the main unit to allow the main unit to enable the requested function." Claim 6 has also been amended to recite "wherein the requested function can be executed."

Claim 11 has been amended to recite "an electronic device removably connectable to the main unit for exchanging data with the main unit and for executing a requested function, the electronic device comprising a register for performing setting of category numbers of functions to be executed by the electronic device and associated with different types of

devices." Claim 11 has been further amended to improve its form in view of the use of the term of "category numbers."

Claims 12 and 14 have been amended to improve their form in view of the amendments to claim 11. Claim 13 has been amended to improve its form also.

Claim 16 has been amended to recite "the codes representing functions associated with different devices."

Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing amendments to the claims do not add new matter to the specification. Antecedent support for the amendments may be found by reference to, for example, paragraphs [0006], [0032] and [0038] of the specification.

In the Official Action, the Examiner maintained his rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. (Official Action, 3.) In particular, the Examiner indicated that "There is nothing in the specification that teaches changing a requested function in the code in the read and write area [if the register matches." Claim 6 has been amended to recite "a read area in which the code of a function selected in the electronic device is read and detected by the main unit to allow the main unit to enable the requested function." As noted above, support for this amendment can be found in paragraph [0006] of the specification, which at the last sentence states: "Thus, the main unit can reliably enable a desired function." As the requested function is the desired function, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under §112, paragraph 1. Applicant also further notes that this amendment to claim 6 addresses the Examiner's response to applicant arguments regarding the §112, paragraph 1 rejection. (See Official Action, 2.)

The Examiner rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Nos.

6,164,549 to Richards ("*Richards*"), 6,213,392 to Zuppichich ("*Zuppichich*") and 6,574,677 to Song et al. ("*Song*"). In rejecting the independent claims (claims 1, 6, 11 and 16) over *Richards* and *Zuppichich*, the Examiner asserts that it "would have been obvious to combine the function code checking of Richards with the function code matching of Zuppichich in order to identify the limitations of the card with respect [to] the requested functions." (Official Action, 4.)

Applicant respectfully submits that in light of the amendments to the independent claims, the Examiner's rejections are now moot. In particular, none of the references cited by the Examiner disclose that codes or category numbers of functions are "associated with different types of devices." As explained at paragraph [0038] of the specification, the different codes or category numbers may represent, for example, the function of an information device, communication device or a Bluetooth device. None of the references cited by the Examiner disclose this feature of the invention which is now recited in each of the independent claims.

In particular, claim 1 recites "the register having a write area and a read area for setting of codes of functions associated with different types of devices and to be executed by the electronic device." Claim 6 recites "a register for setting codes of functions to be executed by the electronic device and associated with different types of devices." Claim 11 recites "an electronic device removably connectable to the main unit for exchanging data with the main unit and for executing a requested function, the electronic device comprising a register for performing setting of category numbers of functions to be executed by the electronic device and associated with different types of devices." Claim 16 recites "wherein the main unit is adapted to write a code of a function requested by the main unit in the write area, to read a code of a function to be executed

from the read area and to control execution of the requested function in the electronic device based on the read code, the codes representing functions associated with different devices."

In the Official Action, the Examiner also responded to applicant's previous argument relating to *Richards* by indicating that he "believed that the applicant is making an argument that is contrary to the teachings of the specification." (Official Action, 2.) It is respectfully submitted that applicant's arguments are consistent with the teachings of the specification. Applicant's argument was and is that *Richard's* IC card controls the determination of whether the IC card is compatible with a terminal or main unit. In contrast, in the claimed invention it is the main unit that determines compatibility by writing a code to the write area and recognizing whether that the function associated with the code is installed in the electronic device. Paragraph [0032] of the specification teaches this feature of the invention by stating: "Thus, the main unit 100 recognizes that the desired function is not installed in the electronic device 200. Accordingly, the main unit 100 can smoothly perform processing such as cancellation of the execution of the function." This feature is captured in each of the independent claims as set forth in the amendment mailed June 13, 2005. Applicant again respectfully submits that the claims are distinguishable over *Richards* in at least this respect.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 are not rendered obvious for at least the reasons set forth above. In addition, as all the other claims pending in the application depend from one of the independent claims, these claims are also not rendered obvious for at least the foregoing reasons.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable

reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: January 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Orville R. Cockings

Registration No.: 42,424

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant